

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the patentability of the claims of the instant application is solicited in view of the above amendments and the following comments. The claims have been amended to put them in better form for United States patent practice. The amendments do not address patentability and therefore do not introduce any prohibited new matter or prosecution history estoppel.

In the outstanding action, the examiner has indicated the allowability of original claims 13-17 and 20-24. The amendments introduced into these claims are editorial only and do not affect their scope or allowability in any way.

In the outstanding action, the examiner has rejected the patentability of claims 7 and 29 for including "the rule of three sum", which was not previously explained. The instant amendment deletes this material from the claims wherefore this rejection should be dropped. This amendment has not reduced the scope of these claims but has merely changed them to use language that is likely to be more familiar. These amendments do not raise any prosecution history estoppel as their scope has not been reduced by these amendments.

The examiner has rejected claims 10 and 32 for containing a feature of "using". These claims have been amended to delete this feature. No prosecution history estoppel has been introduced by these amendments because they have not reduced the scope of these claims.

In the outstanding action, the examiner has rejected the patentability of claims 1, 2, 18 and 19 as being anticipated by the disclosure of the cited '672 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In Ramasubramanian, a band width between server 132 and client 110 is such that only a highly compressed video file 134 can be delivered in real-time in normal speed playback (please see column 6, lines 19-22). When a user selects a "slow" button, a video stream from a less-compressed video file can be delivered to the client at a slower frame transmission rate. Consequently, a higher quality image will be displayed during slow motion playback (please see column 6, lines 25-39). That is, the slower the frame rate that is specified by the user, the lower will be the compression ratio employed by the video decoder. Consequently a higher quality image will be displayed on video display 112 during slow motion playback (Column 5, lines 9-13). In this case, when a user selects the "pause" button, the playback of video (executed in a normal speed playback) is paused. When the user selects a camera button (to select the slowest frame transmission rate), the video information corresponding to a particular frame displayed in video image 114 is transmitted from a least-compressed video file (at the slowest frame transmission rate), and the client receives a still "snapshot" of the particular frame. The still "snapshot" has a much higher resolution and quality than when the same frame was delivered to the client in real time in normal speed playback (please see column 6, lines 48-67 and column 7, lines 1-3)

Therefore, in Ramasubramanian, the user can view an image at a low resolution in the normal speed playback and then view the image at a high resolution in the slow motion mode. However, there is no disclosure of combining two images with each other to obtain a combined image having a resolution higher than those of the two images alone. In other words, data of the low resolution image is not included with data of the high resolution image

In contrast, in the present invention, as represented by any of the claims 1 18, 25, 27, 29, 30 and 31, the quality supplement data portion is added to the basic data portion to obtain a quality-enhanced version, and the quality-enhanced version is displayed. Therefore, even though the bandwidth of the transmission path between the server and the client is limited to a low value, because the basic data portion and the quality supplement data portion that are being transmitted from the server through the transmission path are added to each other in the client's terminal to obtain the quality-enhanced version displayed for the user. Therefore the smaller bandwidth transmission path can be more efficiently used.

It Is therefore clear that this reference does not anticipate the instant claimed invention..

In the outstanding action, the examiner has rejected the patentability of claims 7-12 and 29-34 as being directed to subject matter that would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in this art from a consideration of the disclosure of the '672 patent. This rejection too is respectfully traversed.

As was pointed out above, the whole import of the reference is different from what is disclosed and claimed in the instant patent application. The instant invention is based on there being two separate data quality portions, the basic data portion and at least one quality supplement portion. These are sent to the user's terminal from a server as separate entities. They are then combined in the user's terminal, not the sender's equipment. This enables the system to employ transmission paths with lesser bandwidth. The reference does not disclose this. Therefore, the instant claims do not define subject

matter that would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art from a consideration of the disclosure of the '672 patent.

Respectfully submitted,
LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Customer No 22429

Michael G. Gilman
Registration No 19114
Attorney for the applicants

1700 Diagonal Road,
Suite 300
Alexandria, VA 22314
Voice 703 684 1111
FAX 703 518 5499
Docket No. 041-2063
June 7, 2004
MGG